



**GAS IMPORT JETTY AND PIPELINE PROJECT  
ENVIRONMENT EFFECTS STATEMENT  
INQUIRY AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

**TECHNICAL NOTE**

**TECHNICAL NOTE NUMBER:** TN 045

**DATE:** 26 October 2020

**LOCATION:** Crib Point Jetty Works and Pipeline Works

**EES/MAP BOOK REFERENCE:** Technical Report J, Chapter 15

**SUBJECT:** Response to IAC RFI 098 - Section 11.1, RFI 099 - Section 11.2, RFI 100 - Section 11.3 and RFI 101 - 11.4 in relation to use of rail line right of way, sight distance issues with access tracks, preferred over-dimensional vehicle routes and disposal of oily sludge from FSRU.

**SUMMARY** Further information in relation to use of rail line right of way, sight distance, preferred over-dimensional vehicle routes and disposal of oily sludge from FSRU

**REQUEST:** See below

**NOTE:**

**[98] Elaborate on the discussion at page 19 on options for future rail line upgrade.**

1. Refer to response to IAC RFI 096 in Technical Note 020 (tabled document 240).

**[99] Explain how the issue of identified limited sight distance at several intersections with pipeline access tracks and recommended track alignment modifications has been addressed and the implications it has for the Project design and land acquisition.**

2. There are unlikely to be implications for the Project design or any requirement for additional land acquisition to facilitate safe vehicle movements at intersections where safe intersection sight distances (**SISD**) limitations were identified, once appropriate mitigation measures have been applied.
3. As identified in Section 8.1.4.1 of EES Technical Report J: *Transport impact assessment*, safe intersection sight distances were assessed within the study area. This was a high-level assessment of the intersections between access tracks and the road network. The assessment acknowledged that during the construction stage, trucks would be using existing road intersections, some of which might not be conforming to current design and safety standards.
4. The assessment recommended that the proponents investigate access track alignment modifications to improve safe intersection sight distances. If access track alignments cannot be altered due to constraints, the assessment recommended the proponent consider:
  - (a) Management measures such as advanced warning signage and a reduced posted speed limit to be agreed with the road authority

- (b) Avoidance measures such as removing the access track with construction vehicles accessing the ROW via other tracks.
5. The Transport Impact Assessment also recommended that a Road Safety Audit be undertaken upon finalisation of the proposed routes and access tracks to ensure safe vehicle movements to the satisfaction of the responsible road management authority. Finalisation of the proposed routes and access tracks to be used during construction will occur during detailed design and construction planning, and therefore any Road Safety Audit will need to occur after this is complete, but prior to the commencement of construction.
  6. This recommendation was supported in the evidence of Ms Charmaine Dunstan (document 79), who notes that trucks require longer SISD distances due to the nature of truck characteristics (slower breaking and acceleration), and therefore access tracks should be assessed for SISD for trucks at the time of the Road Safety Audits of each access track. The evidence of Ms Dunstan also notes that these Road Safety Audits should be completed before construction commences.
  7. As identified in Section 5.4.8 of the evidence of Ms Dunstan and Section 4 of the Response to Evidence Statement of Ms Dunstan (document 211), the mitigation measures identified by the Transport Impact Assessment for sight distance limitations are appropriate (MM-TP01 and MM-TP04). Ms Dunstan found that a Road Safety Audit of each access track intersection before construction is the right assessment tool to ensure safe access at each location. Many of the sight distance issues identified at each of the access track locations are related to vegetation in the road reserve, which simple vegetation pruning may resolve. The first step to improve safe intersection sight distance should be through physical measures such as relocating the access tracks or vegetation pruning (within the constraints of the approved construction footprint and limit of vegetation clearance), followed by management solutions such as signs or traffic management where physical measures are not possible.
  8. In her Response to Evidence Statement, Ms Dunstan confirmed that detailed review of sight distance at access track locations should be undertaken closer to the start of construction. This is on the basis that, over the life of the project, road conditions change, and construction schedules, patterns, timing and methods evolve. Ms Dunstan states she is satisfied that the location and design of access tracks is not an issue that is unresolvable, and any impacts (such as traffic management) would be temporary as the project moves along the construction route.
  9. The recommendations in EES Technical Report J: *Transport impact assessment* were incorporated into POS A8 in the Day 1 CEMP Appendix J, which reads:  

POS A8  
*A Traffic Management Plan (TMP), approved by the relevant local government authorities and VicRoads, will be in place prior to the commencement of construction.*  
*The TMP will include the following:*

    - stakeholder and communications arrangements
    - Public transport [and school bus](#) disruption management
    - Level crossing audit requirements for the level crossing adjacent to Frankston-Flinders Road
    - Road safety audit requirements
    - Pavement strength survey and condition assessment requirements
  10. It is proposed to make additional changes to the Day 1 POS A8:
    - (a) Specify “intersection performance” to be covered in the Road Safety Audit, in response to Ms Hilary Marshall’s evidence (document 120), as considered by Ms Dunstan at paragraph 66 of her Response to Evidence Statement (referring to MM-TP01);

(b) Specify requirement to consider safe intersection sight distance (SISD) review.

11. Revised POS A8 now reads (additions since exhibited POS shown underlined, additions since Day 1 version also highlighted):

*A Traffic Management Plan (TMP), approved by the relevant local government authorities and VicRoads, will be in place prior to the commencement of construction. The TMP will include the following:*

- stakeholder and communications arrangements
- Public transport and school bus disruption management
- Pedestrian & cyclist connectivity
- Level crossing audit requirements for the level crossing adjacent to Frankston-Flinders Road
- Road safety audit requirements, including review of performance of key intersections and safe intersection sight distance (SISD) and any necessary mitigation measures.
- car parking management
- Pavement strength survey and condition assessment requirements
- the design, construction and management measures for access point intersections to provide safe vehicle movements

12. Following these changes, POS A8 will fully implement the recommendations of the Transport Impact Assessment, as supported by Ms Dunstan, and ensure that SISD limitations are identified and addressed at the appropriate time.

**[100] Advise whether a preferred route been settled on for route options for OD vehicles carrying nitrogen and odorant to the CPRF.**

13. A preferred route for vehicles carrying nitrogen and odorant to the Crib Point Receiving Facility has not been determined. The preferred route would be confirmed during the detailed design phase and incorporated in the Nitrogen Transport Plan as per EPR-TP07 in Day One EPRs for Crib Point Jetty.

14. The vehicles transporting nitrogen and odorant to the CPRF would not be over-dimensional vehicles. They would most likely be B-Doubles (medium-sized articulated trucks consisting of a towing vehicle and two semi-trailers).

15. Three routes were identified to make nitrogen and odorant deliveries to the Crib Point Receiving Facility. The preferred route for trucks delivering to the Crib Point Receiving Facility would be via the Mornington Peninsula Freeway and Coolart Road or Western Port Highway/Dandenong-Hastings Road and Coolart Road which would avoid safety, amenity and operational impacts through Hastings and other concentrated populations such as Somerville.

16. The proposed routes for deliveries would use the arterial road network and are already approved B-Double routes for most of their journey, except for Woolleys Road and The Esplanade (the last three kilometres of this trip).

17. As identified in Section 5.5.1 of the evidence of Ms Dunstan, VicRoads expressed their support during consultation for a route that avoids the town centre of Hastings. While one of the three routes proposed would use Frankston-Flinders Road through Hastings, it is evident that this road is specifically designed for truck access. It already carries a large number of trucks, directly services a large number of industrial uses and effectively bypasses the town centre of Hastings.

18. As identified in Section 5.5.1 of the evidence of Ms Dunstan, any of the three routes proposed are a practical possibility for B-Double access to the Crib Point Receiving Facility.

**[101] Explain how the proposed 25 tonnes of oily sludge produced each week will be disposed of, and if it is to be trucked away from the site, provide advice on the likely number and type of truck movements and the route they would take.**

19. Section 7.9.4 of EES Technical Report A: *Marine biodiversity impact assessment* identifies that:

*'Operation of the FSRU would generate wastes including sludge from various activities. It is expected that up to 25 t of sludge would be generated per month from marine diesel oil and lube oil purifiers, as well as oil residue from drain, drip trays, oil separators and sludge units from ongoing operation of the FSRU. This sludge and waste oil would be collected by a licenced contractor and disposed of at a licenced facility for treatment and reuse/disposal by a licenced contractor.'*

20. Note that EES Technical Report A identifies that the anticipated volume of sludge that would be generated by the FSRU is 25 tonnes *per month*, not *per week*.

21. Sludge produced from the FSRU would be either pumped to deck for disposal at a licenced facility for treatment and reuse/disposal by a licenced contractor, or pumped to a Sludge Dewatering Unit where the sludge is separated into bilge water (Bilge Holding Tank) or oil residue (Oily Bilge Tank), prior to disposal to a licenced facility. If the sludge tank is pumped out for disposal, pump out would likely occur every three to four weeks. If the sludge is separated and sent to bilge tanks, waste would likely require disposal every three months.

22. Sludge and other forms of waste generated by the FSRU would be managed in accordance with the *Environment Protection (Industrial Waste Resource) Regulations 2009* and disposed via truck or barge to a licenced facility.

23. The disposal of oily sludge from the FSRU would require approximately 12 truck movements per year. This very small increase in traffic volumes would have negligible potential for deleterious effects.

24. Truck movements and routes for waste disposal would be identified in the Traffic and Transport Management Plan to be included in the Operational Environmental Management Plan for the Gas Import Jetty Works, which would be prepared in accordance with the relevant conditions of the Incorporated Document.

**CORRESPONDENCE:** N/A

**ATTACHMENTS:** N/A